

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN NEW YORK CITY, DECEMBER 29, 1936

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1937, was held in the office of McKim, Mead and White, 101 Park Avenue, on Tuesday, December 29, 1936. The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Clarke,
Mr. Lawrie,
Mr. Howells,
Mr. Savage,
Mr. Borie,
also H. P. Caemmerer,

Executive Secretary and Administrative Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 10:00 A. m.

1. DESIGNS FOR NEW PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE BRIDGE: The Commission considered a series of drawings submitted by Colonel Dan. I Sultan, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia for a new Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge, S. E., of which Messrs. Parsons, Klapp, Brinckerhoff & Douglas are engineers and McKim, Mead and White are architects. Mr. E. L. Macdonald represented the firm of engineers and Mr. William Mitchell Kendall and Lawrence White represented the architects.

Mr. Macdonald explained the drawings, five of which suggested steel bridges and three masonry bridges. He commented on each of the drawings and submitted the following statement in explanation of the plans:

The first design worked up was the arched cantilever truss bridge with seven main spans of 162 feet each. There would be four parallel trusses to support the 60-foot roadway and two 8-foot sidewalks. The park roadway on the West bank will pass under one of the main spans but on the East bank the roadway will be spanned by a simple plate girder span similar to those crossing the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks on that bank. This design is shown on the Engineering Drawing marked P-6, and would cost about a million and a quarter.

The arched cantilever plate girder design shown on Engineering Drawing P-1 uses the same span length as the design P-6 and has four parallel lines of girders corresponding to the four trusses, and is an attempt to minimize the supporting steel. It would also avoid the displeasing effect of a multitude of steel members pointing in various directions that one would get when looking at the truss bridge from such an angle that portions of all four trusses would show up one behind the other. The girder design would cost from \$100,000 to \$150,000 more than the truss design.

The design shown on Drawing P-2 comprises five 272-foot spans of through tied arch ribs. This design has the advantage of giving sufficient clearance over the railroad, with the main span designed so that there would be uniform type of construction from abutment to abutment. The disadvantage is that if the bridge is to be built half of the roadway width at a time in order to maintain traffic on the old bridge, without offsetting the center line of the new one too far from the present center line, a truss on the center line of the roadway would have to be included, giving three trusses in all and calling for a divided roadway across the bridge. This design would cost about a million and a half.

Sheet P-4 shows the river spanned in three jumps with a 352-foot central span flanked by a 288-foot span on each end. This design would place only two piers in the river as against the six in designs P-1 and P-6. From the structural engineer's standpoint it would be a daring and striking structure. So far as we know there has been no other attempt made in this country to utilize such long and shallow spans. Its cost too, would be about a million and a half.

The fifth steel design is marked P-5 on the Engineering Drawing and consists of steel rib deck arches similar to those used on the Anacostia River Bridge just below Pennsylvania Avenue. For this design we have shown five spans of 227 feet each. There would be four arch ribs in each span corresponding to the four lines of parallel trusses in the first design mentioned. This design would cost \$150,000 to \$200,000 more than a million and a half, the increase being due primarily to the fact that the piers would have to be considerably larger than with any of the other steel designs, to take care of the horizontal thrust inherent in arches. The other four steel designs would result in vertical loads on the piers, except from secondary forces, which is quite desirable from an engineering standpoint where the only practical type of foundation is the placing of the piers on piles, as will be true at this site. This does not mean that the arch type would not be safe if built. It merely means that it is at a disadvantage in the matter of economy.

Drawing P-3 shows a bridge of seven main arches of approximately 160 feet each, built of reinforced concrete but faced with granite

and red brick. This bridge is considered by the architects to be the most suitable for the site. It will give an appearance of being more substantial and artistic than a bridge of steel or of plain concrete, but at the same time it is not so elaborate or ambitious as a monumental stone bridge like the Arlington Memorial. Its cost would be two and a half or three million dollars.

P-7 shows a reinforced concrete bridge of longer spans, having only five spans averaging 225 feet in length. The effort in this design was to provide a masonry bridge of as slender dimensions as practicable. This design we believe would cost about the same as P-3, the increased length of spans causing enough expense to practically offset the facing on the bridge with the shorter spans.

On all of the designs the roadway is 60 feet wide, the piers are normal to the center line of the bridge, and except for P-2, have a break in their typical construction in order to accommodate the railroad tracks on the Washington side of the river.

Mr. Kendall commented on the brick-faced masonry bridge design, which he thought would be more appropriate for Washington.

The Commission after consideration of all the plans, selected of the steel bridges one showing six piers and a continuous girder. Attention was called to the design showing only two piers and a 500-foot girder. Mr. Macdonald said that this is preferred by the engineers as no bridge of its kind has been built in the United States. Mr. Clarke felt that this design is faulty in that it suggests really three different types of bridges, that is, masonry at the end of the steel girders and also a half masonry span.

Mr. Kendall recommended strongly the masonry bridge, suggesting brick-faced masonry, similar to the Charles River Bridge in Cambridge. This he explained would cost considerably more than the steel girder bridge but is a much better looking bridge and in his opinion is more appropriate for Washington. The steel girder bridge Mr. Macdonald said would cost about \$1,500,000 and the brick bridge \$2,500,000. A report recommending each of these designs was sent to Colonel Sultan. (Exhibit A)

2

2. NEW DESIGN FOR CHAIN BRIDGE: The secretary showed the Commission a design received from Colonel Sultan for a combination cantilever and continuous girder bridge designed by Modjeski, Masters and Case. The Commission were glad to see this drawing and stated it would be a great improvement over the former design submitted calling for an overhead truss bridge. This continuous girder bridge is to have a 30-foot roadway and two sidewalks. The point was brought out that a three-lane bridge is undesirable for traffic reasons, but it is understood from Colonel Sultan that it will be really but a two-lane bridge. Dr. Jordan of the Washington Board of Trade was also present and called attention to a letter he had received from the engineers as to the new design. The design was approved. (Exhibit B and B-1) A report was also sent to Senator Glass. (Exhibit B-2)

3. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE STATUARY: Mr. Friedlander submitted samples of Mt. Airy granite and of Chelmsford, Massachusetts, granite for consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts for stone to be used for the Arlington Memorial Bridge statuary. Mr. Friedlander said that both granite and marble firms have submitted the same estimate of cost for stone. Mr. Friedlander said he liked Chelmsford granite very much because it is more suitable for carving.

Mr. Fraser, who was also present, confirmed what Mr. Friedlander had said about there being no difference in price between granite and marble. The total cost is about \$40,000 more for each group than originally contracted for. The Commission felt that in the circumstances Mt. Airy granite had best be used and that efforts should be made to get an additional appropriation from Congress to carry out the work on the statues. The secretary stated that the National Park Service has taken up the matter with the Comptroller General.

4. NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART: Mr. Moore reported that he had received a letter from Mr. Pope stating that sketches had been prepared for a national gallery of art for the location recommended between Fourth and Seventh Streets on the north side of the Mall. This would involve closing Sixth Street across the Mall. Mr. Clarke said he felt it would improve the appearance of the Mall to close Sixth Street, as did also other members of the Commission. Accordingly the closing of Sixth Street across the Mall in connection with the site of the National Gallery of Art was agreed to.

5. AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT MEMORIAL: Under date of December 23, the following letter was received from Mr. F. C. Lucas, Secretary of the War Memorial Committee, Agriculture Department, requesting advice as to improved legibility of the lettering on their memorial:

December 23, 1936.

Dear Mr. Caemmerer:

Referring to our previous correspondence with regard to the War Memorial Plaque in the patio of the Administrative Building of the Department of Agriculture, I am again bringing to the attention of the Commission the apparent desirability of taking appropriate steps to so treat the lettering on the memorial as to make it legible under normal conditions. It is now difficult to read the list of names of the deceased except under strong light and under close inspection.

I have before requested your advice as to what might be done to obviate this regrettable condition, and wondered if it might be feasible or desirable to gild the lettering in some manner. My previous request for the Commission's advice was answered by suggesting that I write the sculptor, Mr. John Flanagan, of New York City, which I did, but failed to receive any reply.

As the Commission is an authority on such matters, and I do not know any other source of information on this subject upon whose judgment I might rely, I respectfully request that our problem be given the attention of the Commission or such other sculptural authority as the Commission may see fit to select for that purpose.

Very truly yours,
(Signed) F. C. Lucas, Secretary,
War Memorial Committee, U.S.D.A.

The matter was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Lawrie, who suggested using wax and ochre around the letters to bring them out; he said it would be bad to use gilt in the letters. It was also suggested that Mr. Flanagan be consulted.

(Mr. Flanagan called at the office the first week in January and settled the matter with the Agriculture Department.)

6. LIGHTING SECOND DIVISION MEMORIAL: Mr. Fraser was asked by Mr. Moore what he thought of flood lighting the Second Division Memorial as desired by the Second Division Association. Mr. Fraser said he did not favor the idea as it would be apt to distort the monument. The other members of the Commission agreed with Mr. Fraser in this matter.

7. JEFFERSON MEMORIAL: The secretary reported that he had been able to get some pictures of the studies submitted in the competition for the Roosevelt Memorial in 1925. These the Commission wanted in connection with the study of the Jefferson Memorial site south of the Washington Monument that is being considered.

The Commission adjourned at 1:00 p. m. The Commission were the guests of Mr. Savage at a delightful luncheon at the Century Club. Mr. Kendall, Mr. Lawrence White, Mr. Wm. Adams Delano, Mr. Fraser and Mr. Friedlander were also present.

COPY

The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington

December 30, 1936.

Dear Colonel Sultan:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting in New York on December 29, 1936, considered the designs submitted by you for the new Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge, S. E. The Commission met at the office of McKim, Mead and White, consulting architects of the bridge, and were in conference with Mr. William M. Kendall and Mr. Lawrence White, representing the firm, and also with Mr. E. L. Macdonald, representing the firm of Parsons, Klapp, Brinckerhoff & Douglas, engineers, of New York City.

The Commission after detailed consideration of all the designs, approved for development first the design P-1 (also marked A) providing for a continuous steel plate girder bridge with steel arches, and roadway to be 60 feet wide, with an 8-foot sidewalk on each side.

Secondly, for development, the design of a masonry bridge P-3 (also marked B), which contemplates a bridge with brick facing.

This Commission understand that the steel girder bridge above mentioned can be built within the estimate of about \$1,500,000, while the masonry bridge would cost considerably more. The Commission believe, however, that the design for a brick-faced masonry bridge is of such high merit in itself, and is so much in harmony with the recently built bridges in the District of Columbia that it should be developed for presentation and consideration.

In approving these preliminary drawings, the Commission understand that further detailed studies will be submitted when developed.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) Charles Moore

Chairman.

Colonel D. I. Sultan,
Engineer Commissioner,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit A

BRIDGES, EASTON and CO.
Consulting Engineers

22 Lombard St. Boston,
Mass., U.S.A.

Mr. Rodjeski
Mr. M. J. Eastern
Mr. J. J. J. J.

Tejstere Building
Philadelphia, Pa.

Architects Building
Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. J. J. J. J.
Mr. J. J. J. J.
Mr. J. J. J. J.

Dear Sir:

REPLY TO YOUR LETTER OF JANUARY 22

As requested we are returning promptly herewith the original and
pictures received many thanks for your letter of January 22 and submit the
following for your information.

We were very glad by the Commissioners of the District of
Columbia, late in November, to check and comment on the design
of the superstructure of the proposed chain bridge, which design contained
plated erecting truss-type at this location. We felt it part of our duty
to the Commission to comment upon the design and we have given consid-
eration to all of the various types of structures suitable for this
location and the existing conditions.

We have submitted to the Commissioners, a sketch of a proposed
combination cantilever and continuous span deck girder bridge and have re-
commended this type of construction for the following reasons:

- (1) There will be no steelwork above the roadway level except
the sidewalk handrailings and the best view of the valley
can be obtained from this type of structure.
- (2) At the arched bottom line of the girders proposed, we
believe it will make a pleasing and symmetrical appearing
structure.
- (3) It provides for a roadway width of 30', 2 full traffic
lanes and two 5' sidewalks. Additional lanes when needed
can be easily and economically provided without traffic
interruption.
- (4) This structure can be erected in a short time and requires
a minimum interruption to the existing traffic.
- (5) It uses all of the existing masonry and requires a minimum
change in this masonry.
- (6) It is the most economical of all types of structures
considered and requires the lowest cost in maintenance.
- (7) It conceals and provides excellent protection for the
water pipes and utilities.

Exhibit B

This proposed type of construction was developed by us prior to the receipt of the proposed plans for continuous girder construction, submitted by the Fine Arts Commission, or the plan of the continuous suspension bridge which you sent us today. We did, however, give consideration to the continuous type of suspension bridge when developing the plan which we submitted. We believe that the plan submitted overcomes the objections raised in your letter.

This matter is under consideration by the District Commissioners and we feel sure that they will give every consideration to all plans and will adopt that plan which in their judgment fully meets all the requirements.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM L. BARTON & LANE
Engineers

By F. W. Masters

FM:CM

CC-Phila

Capt. W. C. Whitehurst

The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington

December 30, 1936.

Dear Colonel Sultan:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on December 29, 1936, considered the revised design for Chain Bridge, prepared by Modjeski, Masters and Case, engineers, of Philadelphia. The Commission noted that this design provides for a combination cantilever and continuous span deck girder bridge. The Commission unanimously approved the design.

The Commission of Fine Arts understand that you will submit detailed drawings later, showing the treatment of the abutments and of the railing; also of the two approaches.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Col. D. I. Sultan,
Engineer Commissioner,
District of Columbia,
Washington, D. C.

Exhibit B - 1

COPY

The Commission of Fine Arts
Washington

December 30, 1936.

My dear Senator Glass:

I am sending to you herewith a copy of the report sent to Colonel Sultan, from which you will observe that the Commission of Fine Arts have approved a revised design for Chain Bridge. This is a combination cantilever and continuous girder bridge, prepared by the engineers, Modjeski, Masters and Case, of Philadelphia. It carries out the idea suggested by the design which accompanied my letter to you of December 14th. A copy of it was also sent to the firm and this revised design is the result. I enclose a print of it.

The design is considered by all the members of the Commission of Fine Arts a distinct improvement over the truss bridge design heretofore considered. It provides for ample floodway and is a more appropriate design for its location in the valley of the Potomac. Colonel Sultan proposed to use it for a two-lane bridge. The bridge can be built within the amount of \$350,000 authorized by Congress, and is of such a character that, when in the years to come it is desired to widen it, this can be easily done. We hope the design will commend itself to you.

With best wishes for the New Year, I am,

Sincerely yours,
(Signed) Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Hon. Carter Glass,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. 2. Jefferson

38. Personnel Matters:

MESSRS. SETTLE and BROWN reported that MR. BROWN'S Secretary, MISS MARGARET M. CLARK, was resigning November 30, 1936, to be married, and they recommended employment of a Clerk to fill her position from December 1, 1936 to June 30, 1937, at a salary of \$1800 per annum.

MOTION unanimously carried authorizing the Executive Officer to employ a Clerk at a salary not exceeding \$1800 per annum for the period extending from December 1, 1936 to June 30, 1937.

RECESS: The Commission recessed for lunch from 1:30 to 2:00 p.m., for a joint meeting with the National Commission of Fine Arts.

PRESENT.

MEMBERS: MR. F. A. DELANO, Chairman.
MR. CAMMERER, Vice Chairman.
COL. HANFUM.
COL. SULTAN.
MR. SHERMAN.
MR. NICHOLS.
MR. W. A. DELANO.
MR. HUBBARD.

Members of the staff also present.

The National Commission of Fine Arts, including DR. CHARLES MOORE, the Chairman, and MR. H. P. CAMMERER, Secretary, were present for a joint meeting with the Commission.

39. Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge:

COL. SULTAN, in discussing this project, stated - "This bridge is still in the stages of planning. Congress appropriated \$25,000 for the preparation of plans, and after considerable discussion in the District Building, we wrote to five outstanding firms of consultants on bridges. We told them of our problem and invited them to inform us what their fee would be for such service, and that method was approved by the Comptroller General. We entered into an agreement with the firm of Parsons, Brinkerhoff and Douglass, and they are to give us five sketches of different types of bridges, with an over-all estimate of what they would cost. It is hoped then that we will be able to inform them of the two that are considered the best and they will then take those two bridges and give us more detailed costs. Then we propose to tell them which bridge to prepare plans and specifications for. MR. DOUGLASS is coming down next Friday for his first conference since signing the contract. I would like to have suggestions of what those five plans should be. We thought at first of leaving it open for our consultants, but if there are any particular ideas that these two Commissions care to have included, we would be glad to go along with them and put them into the discussion. Conditions are fairly well known there. We have had borings, and we are asking for plans taking the foundation conditions into account. The bridge will be about 1350 feet long, and will include the railroad over-

pass. We have no serious navigation problems there because the new bridge will clear the railroad and will comply with navigation requirements. We intend to build the new bridge next to the old one, and will keep the old bridge in operation so that traffic will not be interfered with, but the old bridge will not form any part of the new bridge. We are figuring on a 60-foot traffic width. We will have to have pile foundations because we cannot get down to rock. As to the material to be used and best suited to the foundation conditions and what the consultants can work out on that remains to be seen. As an engineer, I would prefer a steel bridge."

Brief discussion by members of the Planning Commission and the Fine Arts Commission.

No action.

40. Chain Bridge: (See also Para. 37 and 45):

COL. SULTAN, in discussing this project, stated - "\$350,000 has been appropriated for repairs to this bridge. In appearing before Congress, and in the various discussions leading up to the making of that appropriation, Congress was told that the plan was to utilize the present piers, to raise the bridge on the Virginia side about 8 feet, and on the District side from 4 to 5 feet. The present bridge is not level, but these changes will make it level, and unfortunately the present bridge is lowest over the channel of the river. Congress was told we would retain the present piers and put on them a bridge of the maximum width that would be possible. The roadway cannot be over 29 feet and will be between 28 and 29 feet in the clear, to be determined after the detailed plans are prepared. There will be at least one sidewalk, and if there is money enough, we may have two. The idea is to provide a simple steel structure that would replace the present bridge that has been considered unsafe. On the District side, we have tried to ease the approach and the bad turn, and have negotiated with the Canal Company, and they will probably impose no objections for arrangements for a pier in the middle of the Canal. On the Virginia side, we were confronted with the problem of not having all the ground we would like to have. We do not know just what we can do over there, but we are assuming we can use as much of the existing abutments as possible and dress up the sides. We have not yet gone to the Virginia authorities in connection with raising the grades, but they surely know what we have in mind and we hope we will have no complications with them. We own so little ground there that they must cooperate with us. This is a sketch of a very simple type of steel bridge, and the members of the structure can be designed so as to give proper design and provide sidewalks on the outside of the trusses. It is so high over the channel that ordinarily anything could pass under it, but it is still a low level bridge."

Discussion by MR. F. A. DELANO, DR. MOORE; MR. CAMMERER, COL. SULLIN, MR. NICHOLS, MR. HUBBARD and MR. NOLLEN included plans for the high level bridge further upstream from the Chain Bridge; how the present Chain Bridge fits into the plans for the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the Virginia side; filling in the area under the Chain Bridge on the District side; the likelihood that any more extensive improvement of the present Chain Bridge might be considered permanent and thus prevent a high level bridge ever being constructed upstream; that the Commission believes that a high level bridge is the ultimate solution of this problem; question of a high level bridge with approach roads too close to the residential section of Washington for truck traffic; ultimate approach for trucks along the B. and O. freight line in Maryland; that a solution of a bypass route is a bridge at Great Falls; reasons for locating the high level bridge above the present Chain Bridge; and the question of whether the State of Virginia will cooperate in connection with a high level bridge.

The consensus of opinion was that the limitations for improvement of Chain Bridge having been fixed by action of Congress in the Appropriation Act, and due to the necessity for safety, the Commission sees no further action to be taken but to accept the proposed plan, File No. 104-86, for rehabilitation of the Chain Bridge.

DR. MOORE stated that the Commission of Fine Arts has come to about the same conclusion as that reached by this Commission.

41. Flood Control Dike along Independence Avenue:

MR. NOLLEN, in reviewing this project, stated that the U. S. Engineer Office rendered to Congress a report recommending a flood control project to protect downtown Washington, and when that report was submitted, they had in mind a proposal for a dike on the line of Independence Avenue. Subsequent to the time of that document, there was prepared by this Commission, in cooperation with the Park Office, a study of alternative solutions, and later the Commission decided that the proposed levee immediately south of the Navy and Munitions Buildings and through the Monument Grounds was a better solution and would afford sufficient protection until such time as a more permanent solution could be found when the Navy and Munitions Buildings are removed. One solution suggested at that time was that the dike follow the line of Constitution Avenue and across the Monument Grounds. Again in January 1935, the Commission, at the request of the Chief of Engineers, reviewed the previous studies and came to the conclusion that the dike in the temporary location behind the Navy and Munitions Buildings and across the Monument Grounds was a most satisfactory solution, and the principal reason for that action was that the dike along the line of Independence Avenue involved destruction of existing park values, including many trees. The road problem was also involved, as well as the future plan for the Monument Grounds and the Tidal Basin area by the dike being proposed at an elevation of 19.

The Chairman in reviewing this matter stated that the question of the dike again came up when the U. S. Engineer Office stated that Congress had allotted funds for flood prevention throughout the United States, and it might be possible to get funds for providing a permanent solution to this problem, and that now is the time for the Commission to consider whether it wants to adhere to its previous action or take some other action. Then the Commission reconsidered the whole problem. One of the plans provided for a dike along the line of Independence Avenue, and another was the plan for the temporary dike behind the Navy and Munitions Buildings and Monument Grounds.

Discussion by MR. F. A. DELANO, DR. MOORE, MR. CAMMERLIER, MR. HUBBARD, MR. NICHOLS, COL. HANNUM and MR. NOLEN included the fact that the dike now constructed affords adequate protection; plans for the Jefferson Memorial; interference with the view to the Potomac River from the White House if the dike is constructed along Independence Avenue; whether the dike along the line of Independence Avenue would protect enough of East and West Potomac Parks.

No action.

42. Apex Building:

MR. W. E. REYNOLDS, Assistant Director of Procurement, MR. G. W. NOLL of that office, and MR. H. T. FROST of the architectural firm of Bennett, Parsons and Frost, present for discussion of this subject.

MR. FROST submitted the revised plans for the Apex Building, and stated that the terrace at the east end of the building had been placed at a lower level by reducing it about one and one-half feet. The elevation of the terrace is 5 feet 6 inches above the sidewalk. The plans contemplate a pool and fountain on this terrace.

Further discussion of the plans by MR. FROST and members of both Commissions included shortening the length of the plaza toward 6th Street; the question of whether the plans provide that the building be kept within the building lines of the streets.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Commission approves the height of the terrace at the east end of the Archives Building, as shown on plan bearing File No. 1.6-102, subject to approval by the Coordinating Committee as to its relation to streets.

The Chairman requested that a copy of the plan be left with the staff to be checked to determine if there are any encroachments on the street areas.

43. Parking in the Great Plaza:

MR. W. E. REYNOLDS, Assistant Director of the Procurement Division, stated - "This matter has not come to the stage of letting a contract. There was discussion as to whether there should be provision for 1,000 or 500 automobiles, and then plans were developed on the basis of no garage and without parking, and other sketches have been prepared showing parking on the present elevation, and the question is now up in connection with submission to Congress of a request for sufficient funds to develop the plaza. My reaction has been and continues to be against another automobile garage because it is not economical, and we are not enthusiastic about it at all. You would no doubt have congestion if you have over 500 cars. We have prepared a series of sketches showing how it might be developed as a park, and also have different layouts for storage of cars. At a meeting of the Commission some time ago, it was suggested that where you have vacant property, it might be depressed four or five feet and landscaped and thus made an ideal parking place. An under-cover garage for 500 cars in this locality would cost about \$850,000, and if any of these developments are carried out, you would have to add another \$500,000 to that. As the number of cars goes up, the cost goes down. The difficulty here is that you are dumping cars out on traffic arteries. Any recommendation as to this would be quite futile because the whole thing is tied up with what is to be done about the parking problem in the District. If a considerable amount of parking is thought necessary, my recommendation would be for that parking lot as it is now used, and which is a considerable source of revenue to the District. We made a development plan something like this, with no cars and no underground garage. Until the problem is settled as to what will be done with cars, you will not get any commercial enterprise interested in building a private parking garage. They will not build as long as they know the Government will compete with them, and my opinion is that the Government is not responsible to its employees for the parking of their automobiles."

Discussion by MR. F. A. DELANO, DR. MOORE, MR. CAMMERER, MR. W. A. DELANO, MR. HUBBARD, MR. NICHOLS, MR. REYNOLDS and MR. NOLEN included the need for considering parked automobiles as well as those in operation; the number of cars now parked in the Triangle area; the charge for parking of automobiles in Government buildings; DR. MOORE'S suggestion of tearing down the old Metropolitan Hotel and constructing a garage for parking.

MR. REYNOLDS stated further that if it is desired to provide for the parking of automobiles in the Plaza, and the construction of an underground garage is undertaken, that means an entirely different matter to go before Congress with, and means another one and one-half million dollars, and he is strongly opposed to underground garages and prefers the erection of a garage further uptown.

MR. NOLEN summarized figures presented at the June meeting showing the need for providing parking facilities for employees in the Pennsylvania Avenue Triangle. Upon abandonment of the Great Plaza parking area, only 78 off-street parking spaces will be provided for the Labor, Post Office, and Interstate Commerce buildings abutting this area, as against 416 off-street spaces provided for the other three Triangle buildings (Commerce, Internal Revenue and Justice.) This would be a total of only 494 off-street spaces available for the Pennsylvania Avenue Triangle as a whole which now houses more than 20,000 employees, of which, the 1934 survey showed, more than 51 percent travel by automobile.

MR. W. A. DELANO, in discussing this matter, stated that if parking of automobiles is more important than office space, use the office space for that purpose. As to underground parking, it is very expensive and difficult of ventilation, and if parking is necessary in this area, the place to provide this is in the plaza.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Commission approves the plan for the development of the Great Plaza in the Pennsylvania Avenue Triangle, as shown on plan bearing File No. 1.6-104, with the suggestion that the rows of trees extending in an easterly and westerly direction be placed closer together and perhaps a third row of trees might be added; and that the Commission reiterates its previous stand and again calls attention to the fact that no provision has been made for the parking of automobiles.

44. Columbia Island Bridge Connection with
Lee Boulevard and Key Bridge:

MR. NOLEN stated that when this matter was under consideration by the Commission some time ago, the understanding was that a bridge of moderate design, costing about \$150,000 was a desirable solution of the problem.

MR. SPELMAN of the Bureau of Public Roads submitted plans for the proposed bridge and stated that the foundation conditions were bad and it will be necessary to go down to rock. The cost will be approximately \$395,000, and the estimated cost of the structure itself will be about \$300,000; that the structure will be faced with stone, with a concrete framing under the facing; that at present there is available for work on this section of the Memorial Parkway about \$570,000, which was set up for this bridge and the Key Bridge span; that roughly, the two structures will cost about \$750,000, or approximately \$200,000 in excess of the allotment; that in addition to the main arch, two additional arches will be provided for bridlepaths, and in case the two lower level roads are ever built; that the construction of the Columbia Island bridge can be proceeded with and the balance of the funds can be used for preliminary work for providing an additional span in Key Bridge.

Discussion by MR. F. A. DELANO, DR. MOORE, MR. CAMMERER, MR. SPELMAN and MR. NOLLEN included the suggestion of DR. MOORE "of having either a well designed stone or brick bridge, but do not get into a concrete bridge if you can help it;" the suggestion of DR. MOORE that "the Mt. Vernon Highway is not any different in character from the Memorial Parkway, and the treatment used there should be continued on the Parkway, and from Mt. Vernon to Great Falls a continuity of treatment should be provided"; the question of whether the Commission takes any responsibility in approving a plan the cost of which is in excess of the appropriation; (MR. CAMMERER and MR. SPELMAN being of the opinion that the Commission does not take any responsibility, it being up to the agency performing the work); opinion of the Commission that the Columbia Island bridge should be constructed, and the balance of the funds used to begin the Key Bridge span.

MOTION unanimously carried approving design for Columbia Island bridge, as shown on plan dated October 1936, and G362PF - "Boundary Channel Bridge 6-A-2". (N.C.P. & P.C. File No. 1.9-157 and 158).

45. Chain Bridge: (See also Pars. 37 and 40):

The Chairman suggested that the Commission might authorize COL. SULTAN to go ahead with that project along the lines outlined by him.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Commission approves, in principle, the design of the Chain Bridge, as submitted by the Engineer Commissioner of the District Government, as shown on plan bearing File No. 104-86.

46. November Meeting:

MOTION unanimously carried that the dates of the November meeting be November 18 and 19.

ADJOURNMENT: The Commission adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

T. S. SETTLE,
Secretary.

ARNO B. CAMMERER,
Executive Officer.

MR. CHARLES MOORE, Chairman, and MR. H. P. CAEMMERER, Secretary, of the Fine Arts Commission present.

20. Pennsylvania Avenue Bridge:

MR. McDONALD, engineer representing Parsons, Klapp, Brinkerhoff and Douglas; and MR. KRONIN, artist, engaged by the District Government to prepare designs for a bridge to replace the Pennsylvania Avenue bridge, were present and submitted eight designs for the bridge.

CAPT. TANSEY stated that the Engineer Commissioner had requested that five or six designs for a bridge be prepared so that the Commissioners could select two designs, from which one will finally be selected. All piers will have to be on piles on account of foundation conditions.

MR. McDONALD presented the following designs:

Design No. 1 - an arched cantilever truss design with a span of 162 feet. This design gives in effect a continuous arch truss. This is the cheapest design and would cost about \$1,300,000.

Design No. 2 (P-1) - Plate girder design with supporting structures reduced to a minimum. The cost of this design approximately \$50,000 to \$100,000 more than Design No. 1.

Design No. 3 (P-2) - has the supporting steel arch above the roadway and will cost about \$1,400,000. One reason for the four trusses is that the old bridge must be maintained and the new bridge will have to be as close as possible to the old one, and the bridge is so designed that half the new bridge can be built at one time. There would be a truss in the middle of the road.

Design No. 4 (P-7) - This is a reinforced concrete arch design and costs approximately \$2,800,000. This has 226-foot spans against 162-foot spans of Design No. 1.

Design No. 5 (P-3) - with brick-faced arch and granite trim. This bridge has the same span as the previous steel bridges, and is of reinforced concrete faced with red brick and arch rings of granite; cost about \$2,500,000.

Design No. 6 (P-5) - 3 hinged arch, similar to the Navy Yard bridge, and costing about \$1,600,000, and has the same number of arches as the previous design; 226 feet each in length, and has four trusses.

Design No. 7 (5) - length of span 500 feet, and a very attractive design, and different from any bridge built in this country. Continuous thrust from one end to the other, and will cost about \$200,000 more than the previous steel bridge or about \$1,750,000.

COL. SULTAN joined the meeting at this point.

The end span in this bridge accommodates the parkway roads, which are taken care of in other ways in the other designs.

Design No. 8. This design has one additional span and six arches. The sidewalk is carried out on a cantilever bracket, and the bridge would be of reenforced concrete; cost over \$2,000,000.

Discussion by MR. F. A. DELANO, MR. CAMMERER, COL. SULTAN, CAPT. TANSEY, DR. MOORE, MR. W. A. DELANO, MR. HUBBARD and MR. NOLEN included the fact that foundations will have to be on piles; that the foundations are the governing factor in determining the type and cost of the bridge; the relationship of the bridge to the park at the west end of the bridge; the spanning of the railroad tracks and the parkway; locating the piers in the river so as not to obstruct the views up and down the river; roadway to be 60 feet in all designs submitted.

DR. MOORE stated that he preferred Design No. 1 for the steel bridge if the central motif can be eliminated at the west end of the bridge.

The majority of the Commission preferred Design No. 2 for a masonry bridge, with the understanding that the bridge will have one span less and have cantilevered sidewalks.

MR. W. A. DELANO and MR. HUBBARD preferred Design No. 8.

21. Commodore Barney Circle:

MR. NOLEN submitted for action of the Commission three alternative plans for the development of Commodore Barney Circle, which plans take into account the street-car tracks and need for transfer of passengers from street-car to bus, and the alignment of the Circle with the new Pennsylvania Avenue bridge. The Coordinating Committee on November 25th adopted in principle the elliptical island plan giving Pennsylvania Avenue preference and routing both street-car tracks on 15th and on K Streets. Subsequently the P. U. C. and the Director of Traffic recommended the plan similar to that adopted by the Commission in principle in September providing for a street-car and bus loop in the circle. Under these circumstances, Mr. NOLEN and Capt. WHITEHURST recommend the latter plan, report on which has been received since the last meeting of the Coordinating Committee.

Discussion by MR. F. A. DELANO, MR. CAMMERER, COL. SULTAN, CAPT. WHITEHURST and MR. NOLEN included the fact that the plan does not recognize the potential park features in the development of the Circle.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Commission approves the plan for the development of Commodore Barney Circle bearing File No. 23-48, this being a further development of Plan No. 23-47 previously approved in principle.

22. Plans for Chain Bridge:

CAPT. WHITEHURST stated that the Commissioners have continued making studies of the problem of rebuilding the Chain Bridge, and the Consulting Engineers have been able to develop a continuous girder bridge which will do away with the structure above the deck and save an appreciable sum of money. There has been some objection to the through truss type of bridge,

but the problem was to use the existing piers, raised to provide for additional river clearance. The design now submitted will cost approximately \$40,000 less and will provide for a 30-foot roadway on the existing piers; two sidewalks; and the curved approach at the District end. It is estimated that this roadway width will accommodate 1200 vehicles in one hour, as compared with a present maximum peak load of 440 cars in one hour. It will also be possible to widen the bridge at any time at a minimum cost.

MOTION unanimously carried approving the revised design for the Chain Bridge, as submitted by the Engineer Commissioner, and extending a vote of thanks to the Engineer Commissioner for his success in developing this plan.

The Chairman stated that in approving the design of this bridge, the Commission does not abandon the idea that this is not a permanent bridge, and that the Commission does not withdraw its recommendation for a high level bridge farther up the river.

23. Extension of Shipstead Area:

MR. NOLEN reported that an article recently appeared in the newspaper that the Fine Arts Commission is proposing to ask Congress to amend the Shipstead Act to apply to all future structures fronting on public parks, circles and buildings within the District of Columbia. The areas now included under the Shipstead Act were determined under authority contained in the Act of Congress which authorized the Commissioners, in consultation with this Commission, to define the areas within its scope. Accordingly, a plan was drawn up by this Commission and approved by the District Commissioners. It was MR. NOLEN'S opinion that any extension of this area should be handled in the same way.

DR. MOORE of the Fine Arts Commission stated that their Commission has gotten along very satisfactorily with the Shipstead Act, and that they are not seeking additional power or authority; that it was their opinion that it is too dangerous to ask for too much of an increase in area, and that regardless of what is constructed, whether temporary or permanent, it should be in character and keeping with the park. DR. MOORE also discussed the tendency of erecting buildings near embassies, which might also be protected as a matter of courtesy to them.

Discussion by MR. F. A. DELANO, MR. CAMMERER, DR. MOORE and MR. NOLEN.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Secretary of the Commission take up the question of extension of the Shipstead Act, with particular reference to protection of newly authorized Government acquisition areas, and in connection with that include anything else that may be necessary, and take this matter up with the District Commissioners, the Zoning Committee, and the Fine Arts Commission before bringing it back to the Commission for further action. The Secretary was also instructed to prepare a draft of amendment to the Act embodying the action that may be considered necessary.

24. Garage Building at 7th Street and Independence Avenue, S. W.:

MR. NOLEN reported that application has been made to construct a garage building at 7th Street and Independence Avenue, S. W., in the area proposed to be acquired under the Public Buildings Act of 1930, and it was his opinion that this building should not be made to conform to the Shipstead Act, thus causing an increase in the value of the property to that extent. At the present time, it does not front on a park or a public building.

DR. MOORE of the Fine Arts Commission, in discussing this, stated that regardless of the type of building constructed, it should be in keeping with the park area.

CAPT. WHITEHURST called attention to the fact that the Southeast Citizens' Association has been urging the extension of Independence Avenue as soon as possible.

No action.

25. Street Widening Program:

MR. NOLEN submitted for the information of the Commission a proposed street widening program, which will be considered by the Traffic Advisory Council in the near future. This program involves a number of streets on the Commission's major thoroughfare plan. Some of the major widenings are the following: 6th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 17th, M 22nd, E and W Streets, and Independence Avenue. Some of these streets are lined with very fine trees, and some of the property is zoned for residential purposes, and any changes in the street width will necessarily affect property values, and also raise the question of what the effect on the future use of the abutting property will be if an increase in traffic takes place.

CAPT. WHITEHURST stated that last year they were requested to submit a five-year street widening program which could be used as such. The Commissioners were also requested to forward to Congress such a program. This list includes approximately \$1,750,000 worth of work, and the problem is to group this program in such a way that a part can be undertaken each year with the limited appropriations for this purpose. The widening of 13th Street between Monroe and Spring Road is one case where additional land will be required, and an Act of Congress will be necessary to authorize this widening. All those phases of the program must be taken into consideration. By developing such a program as this, the Commissioners will have something definite from which to develop the annual improvement work. He suggested a program of approximately \$250,000 annually for this purpose.

No action.

26. Status of Proposed Abattoir:

MR. SETTLE reported that the District Commissioners have held up the granting of a permit to construct the abattoir until detailed information on the plans is furnished. Representatives of the Interior Department and the District Government have been working on the details of the plan, but are not as yet satisfied with them. The most recent development is a suit for \$150,000 filed by the Company against the Commissioners for damages resulting from the delay in granting the permit. The Interior Department is also planning to file a suit to prevent this abattoir from being erected on the ground that it will be a public nuisance. It is the consensus of opinion that better success will be obtained if the basis for the Government's stand is that it is a nuisance to surrounding Federal improvements. The Department of Justice has requested that they be furnished a plat showing all the public improvements in this area that would be affected by the abattoir, and the staff is now preparing such a plat to be furnished the Department of Justice.

While no action was taken, the Chairman stated that it would be understood that the staff will cooperate with the Department of Justice in furnishing any data that may be needed.

27. Transfers of Land:

(a) Rawlins Park - 18th Street:

MR. NOLAN submitted for approval a plat showing transfer of additional land from the National Park Service to the Commissioners for widening 18th Street. He stated that the additional widening had been requested by the National Park Service, and had already taken place.

MOTION unanimously carried approving transfer of land from Rawlins Park by the National Park Service to the District Commissioners for street widening purposes, as shown on plan bearing File No. 1.8-291.

(b) Part of Turkey Thicket Playground - Perry Street:

MR. NOLAN submitted for approval a plan for the extension of Perry Street across the southern end of Turkey Thicket between Michigan Avenue and 10th Street, N.E., which will involve transfer of land from the National Park Service to the District. The Coordinating Committee believes it desirable to extend Perry Street through from Michigan Avenue to the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad property, and the private property owner on 10th Street has indicated his willingness to dedicate a portion of the street.

MOTION unanimously carried approving transfer of land from Turkey Thicket Playground by the National Park Service to the District Commissioners for the extension of Perry Street, as shown on plan bearing File No. 30-60, subject to the details of this transfer being worked out satisfactorily.

Par. 28. Alley Dwelling Authority Plans: (See Land Purchase Section).

29. Cooperation on Zoning and Subdivision Problems,
Mt. Vernon Highway in Alexandria:

MR. NOLLEN reported that a change in zoning of a large tract of property north of the circle at the north end of Alexandria on the Mt. Vernon Highway has been made to permit multi-family dwellings. On examination of the plans, it was found that houses were being planned facing courts at right angles to the Mt. Vernon Highway, and the houses and lots will side on the Parkway. The City Council has asked the Commission's assistance in studying this problem, and as a result of this request, the staff has prepared study for this area more favorable to the Highway, in which it is proposed to have a border street parallel to the Mt. Vernon Highway, with the houses facing that border street. No additional points of access will be provided to the Highway.

Discussion by MR. F. M. DELANO, MR. CAMMERER, MR. NOLLEN and MR. SETTLE.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Commission approve the idea of a border street outside of and parallel to the Highway, as shown on Plan No. 104.2-228.

MR. SETTLE reported that the Virginia authorities have expressed a willingness to refer all requests for rezoning on the Mt. Vernon Highway to this Commission for a report.

30. District of Columbia - Virginia Boundary Line:

MR. DELANO reported that an article recently appeared in the newspapers that Judge Howard W. Smith of Arlington County proposed to re-introduce the Boundary Bill, and that a letter had been addressed to him to the effect that if he reintroduced his bill, the Chairman would find it necessary to oppose it again. The Chairman and Judge Smith discussed this matter for about two hours, and it is the Chairman's opinion that Judge Smith will be inclined to be more reasonable.

MR. SETTLE reported that Judge Smith had stated that if the Commission will prepare a bill along satisfactory lines, he will be glad to take it up with Arlington County, and if agreeable to Arlington County, as far as the private property owners' claims are concerned, he is willing to drop them. MR. SETTLE submitted draft of bill for approval, and reviewed its scope.

Discussion by MR. F. M. DELANO, MR. CAMMERER, MR. KNEIPP, MR. NOLLEN and MR. SETTLE included the inadvisability of tying this matter up with the airport question; the question of concurrent jurisdiction over the lands in question.

MOTION unanimously carried that MR. SETTLE make the changes in his draft of legislation, as requested by members of the Commission, and that he take this matter up with the Department of Justice and the attorneys of the National Park Service.

31. Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway at the C. and O. Canal:

MR. SETTLE reported that a request has been received for a permit to construct an additional cement bin on the Mole at the end of the C. and O. Canal adjacent to the Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway. The United States has filed a suit claiming this property, which is now occupied by asphalt and cement-mixing activities. The applicant has indicated his willingness to accept a permit, revocable on 30 days' notice, and proposes to erect a type of bin that can be very easily removed.

Discussion by MR. F. A. DELINO, MR. CAMMERER, COL. SULTAN, MR. NOLEN and MR. SETTLE included the question of why the application should be submitted to this Commission instead of the adverse claimant of the property; the question of jeopardizing the claims of the United States by granting the permit; the fact that the industry is now considered a nuisance to the adjoining Parkway, and the question of whether the erection of an additional temporary structure would increase this nuisance.

MOTION unanimously carried that the Commission does not object to the permit to construct a temporary cement bin on the Mole if granted under the terms and conditions outlined by the Secretary.

The Commission recessed at 6 p.m., to reconvene the following morning at 9:30 a.m.

PRESENT.

MEMBERS: MR. F. A. DELANO, Chairman.
MR. CAMMERER, Vice Chairman.
SEN. KING.
COL. HANNUM.
CAPT. TANSEY.
MR. KNEIPP.
MR. W. A. DELANO.
MR. HUBBARD.

Members of the staff also present.

32. Proposed Use of Recreation Areas for School Buildings:

DR. BALLOU, Superintendent of Schools, and DR. WILKINSON, Assistant Superintendent in charge of Colored Schools, present for discussion of this subject.

MR. NOLEN reported that DR. BALLOU and DR. WILKINSON are appearing before the Commission in connection with the proposal to use part of the Banneker Recreation Center as a site for a colored Junior High School. At the request of COL. SULTAN, the Coordinating Committee has considered this matter, which was first suggested by COL. SULTAN'S office. The use of several other recreation and playground areas for school sites are also involved. An initial item for this project has been included in the School Department's current year's budget request. It was presented to the Coordinating Committee and by them referred to the Committee on Recreation Plan, which Committee prepared an illuminating report which it submitted to the Coordinating Committee, and is now submitted to this Commission. The proposals also included the use of the Taft Recreation Center for a Senior High School site, but that was not considered practicable because the building would occupy the entire Center. There has also been some discussion of the Jefferson Junior High School in the southwest section, being placed on the Canal Street Reservation, and an elementary school on the Potworth Playground.

DR. BALLOU made the following statement: "We are confronted with the necessity of a building for a Junior High School accommodating 1200 pupils in the neighborhood of the Banneker Recreation Center area. The population demands that there shall be a school at this point. I would like to state that the suggestion came from the Engineer Commissioner to the Board of Education when we considered the 5-year school needs. He suggested the possible use of District-owned land, or connecting the school needs in relation to the recreation centers. The Board considered that proposal and agreed to it, providing it could be worked out. We believe it is consistent with the idea of all concerned so that the activities will be coordinated as much as possible. It is estimated that it will cost \$300,000 to buy a site in the neighborhood of the Banneker Recreation Center, because we will have to buy improved property, and will have to provide a recreation area for the children.

The Commission reconvened at 10 o'clock a.m., for a joint meeting with the Fine Arts Commission, including its Chairman and Secretary.

MR. JOHN RUSSELL POPE, Architect, and members of his staff, and MR. HOLLINS RANDOLPH, member of the Jefferson Memorial Commission present for this meeting.

PRESENT.

MEMBERS. MR. CAMMERER, Acting Chairman.
SEN. KING.
COL. HANNUM.
COL. SULTAN.
MR. NICHOLS.
MR. W. A. DELANO.
MR. HUBBARD.
MR. KYLIE.

Members of the staff also present.

MR. E. A. SCHMITT of the U. S. Engineer Office, also present.

51. Thomas Jefferson Memorial: (See also Pars. 49 and 55):

MR. ARNO B. CAMMERER, Vice Chairman of the Commission, presided in the absence of the Chairman, FREDERIC A. DELANO.

The Chairman explained that MR. JOHN J. BOYLAN, Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, was unable to be present, but had sent as his representative, MR. HOLLINS N. RANDOLPH, member of the Commission. He then introduced MR. RANDOLPH, who explained the powers and duties of the Jefferson Memorial Commission, and stated that, acting under their powers and duties, the Commission had selected the site, architect and design after full consultation with the President. He stated that the Commission conceived that there were three things to be taken into consideration in connection with the work it was charged to do. The first was to satisfy the people; second, to give due and proper consideration to the character memorialized, and third, to conform with plans of the governmental agencies created by the people through Congress in order that the monument when constructed would be in keeping with the plan of Washington and with other structures already erected or which may hereafter be erected.

MR. CAMMERER explained the various contacts that he and MR. DELANO had had with the Jefferson Memorial Commission from time to time.

MR. POPE was then introduced and explained the memorial design in its relationship to the Lincoln Memorial, Washington Monument, and the proposed treatment of the approaches. He submitted detailed estimates prepared by his engineers showing that the memorial proper would cost \$2,995,000, and the treatment of the grounds would cost approximately \$1,810,000, making a grand total of \$4,805,000.

In the discussion of the Tidal Basin, COL. HANNUM submitted a letter dated October 7, 1936, from HON. MALIN CRAIG, Acting Secretary of War, which is attached as APPENDIX G.

Discussion by SEN. KING, MR. CAMMERER, MR. CHARLES MOORE, MR. POPE, COL. HANNUM, COL. SULTAN, MR. HUBBARD, MR. NICHOLS, MR. W. A. DELANO, MR. CHARLES ELIOT, MR. SETTLE and MR. NOLEN, and every member of the Fine Arts Commission. The discussion included the size of the memorial in its relationship to the Lincoln Memorial; effect upon the Tidal Basin, cherry trees, traffic over the approaches to the Highway Bridge; size and design of memorial; size and height of base; and the additional expense over and above the \$3,000,000 authorized for the construction of the memorial. (For more detailed account of discussion, refer to stenographic record).

The question was raised as to whether or not this was a desirable site for the Jefferson Memorial. DR. MOORE polled the members of the Commission of Fine Arts. They voted unanimously that it was a desirable site. Acting Chairman CAMMERER then polled the members of the Park and Planning Commission, and the majority voted that it is a proper site provided traffic problems and other problems can be worked out.

The Commission then adjourned to luncheon with the Commission of Fine Arts at the Cosmos Club. For final action on the Jefferson Memorial, see Par. 55.

52. National Gallery of Art: (See also Par. 3):

At the conclusion of the luncheon at the Cosmos Club, MR. POPE appeared before the Commission and submitted the ground plans for the National Gallery of Art, and asked the Commission to indicate the set-back lines the Commission would require, as provided for under the National Gallery of Art law. On motion of MR. HUBBARD, the Commission then passed the following resolution:

"Since we have had a setback of 100 feet for public buildings on the Mall that has the general force of law, and since we have under this Bill for the National Gallery the right to determine the building line, we feel that the architect of the Gallery should make no variation from the setback of 100 feet that has been established.

"We agree that the architect may move his building 10 feet nearer Constitution Avenue, so that the west extension is the same distance from the Constitution Avenue curb as the Apex Building, or 74 feet."

The Commission then returned to Room 1615, Navy Building.

53. Gas Stations:

MR. NOLEN brought up the question of ratifying action of the Executive Officer in regard to gas station applications. Because of the lateness of the hour, it was decided to postpone action until the next meeting.

54. Coast Guard Radio Station at Fort Hunt: (See also Pars. 13 & 40):

After further discussion, it was voted that the Executive Officer write a letter to the authorities making request to locate the Coast Guard Radio station at Fort Hunt, to the effect that the Commission believes it will be impracticable to locate a permanent Coast Guard radio station at Fort Hunt; that there would be interference in the joint use of Fort Hunt for recreation and radio purposes; that the Coast Guard authorities be advised to give consideration to other possible sites, including the Beltsville area; and that the Commission and its staff will gladly collaborate with the Coast Guard staff in the selection of such a site.

55. Thomas Jefferson Memorial: (See also Pars. 49 and 51):

At this point MR. HUBBARD submitted first draft of resolution drawn by him regarding the Jefferson Memorial:

MOTION unanimously carried that the resolution as drawn and submitted by MR. HUBBARD be edited by the Executive Officer, then sent to each member of the Commission for suggested revisions, and that the Executive Officer of the Commission, edit same and transmit to the Chairman of the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission.

The resolution as amended and revised by the members of the Commission and edited by the Executive Officer, and transmitted to the Memorial Commission, together with the letter of transmission, is attached hereto as APPENDIX H.

56. Date of Next Meeting:

MOTION unanimously carried that the next meeting of the Commission be held on April 23 and 24.

ADJOURNMENT: The Commission adjourned at 5 p.m.

T. B. SETTLE,
Secretary.

ARNO B. CAMERER,
Executive Officer.

